



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/682,122	07/25/2001	Takayuki Sato	VN-0140US	1135

21874 7590 05/26/2004

EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP
P.O. BOX 55874
BOSTON, MA 02205

EXAMINER

WINDER, PATRICE L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2155

DATE MAILED: 05/26/2004

11

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/682,122

Applicant(s)

SATO, TAKAYUKI

Examiner

Patrice Winder

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 March 2004.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 7-21 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) 3-6 is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-2, 7-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gille, USPN 5,874,964 (hereafter referred to as Gille) in view of Ekstrom et al., USPN 5,968,126 (hereafter referred to as Ekstrom).

3. Regarding claim 1, Gille taught a secure entry system for a building having a plurality of units provided therein (column 5, lines 31-34, 61-63), said system comprising:

an administration server, which is provided in said building, operable to administrate a computer network system (column 5, lines 55-58); and

at least one interconnecting device operable to connect said administration server and respective network devices in said plurality of units (column 5, lines 42-54),

wherein said administration server sets said interconnecting device to assign a plurality of VLANs to each of said units (column 6, lines 20-34), respectively, in such a manner that a VLAN assigned to one of said units is different from VLANs assigned to respective others of said units to provide secure entry to said units and said computer network system in the building (column 7, lines 1-11). Gille does not specifically teach

Art Unit: 2155

each of said units permitting only entry of a designated person thereto. However, Ekstrom taught each of the units permitting only entry of a designated person thereto (column 1, lines 37-47). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Gille's system for network management with Ekstrom's virtual broadcast domains (VBDs). The motivation would have been to integrate membership in VBDs to the identification of the user.

4. Regarding dependent claim 2, Ekstrom taught further comprising a user certifying unit operable to obtain identifying information of a person trying to enter one of said units in the building from said person to certify whether or not said person is a designated person based on said identifying information and to permit only said designated person to enter said one of said one of said units in the building (column 1, lines 37-47).

5. Regarding dependent claim 7, Gille taught said administration server assigns said plurality of VLANs to said units, respectively, to be different from a further VLAN assigned to said administration server (column 7, lines 4-13).

6. Regarding dependent claim 8, Gille taught said administration server assigns said further VLAN, which is assigned to said administration server, to said interconnecting device (column 7, lines 14-16, 25-27).

7. Regarding dependent claim 9, Ekstrom taught said administration server obtains at least one of a communication amount and a communication time period for each connection port of said interconnecting device (column 6, lines 13-22), and controls communication at said each connection port of said interconnecting device based on

said at least one of said communication amount and said communication time period (column 6, lines 7-11).

8. Regarding dependent claim 10, Ekstrom taught further comprising an entrance server operable to administrate an entry of each of said network devices in said plurality of units to said computer network system (column 10, lines 12-17).

9. Regarding dependent claim 11, Ekstrom taught said entrance server has an entrance database operable to store device identifying information for identifying each of said network devices (column 10, lines 20-22), and permits a corresponding one of said network devices that has said device identifying information stored in said entrance data to enter said computer network system (column 10, lines 14-22).

10. Regarding dependent claim 12, Ekstrom taught said entrance database stores a MAC address of said each of said network devices as said device identifying information (column 10, lines 20-22), and said entrance server permits said one of said network devices that has said MAC address stored in said entrance database to enter said computer network system (column 10, lines 14-22).

11. Regarding dependent claim 13, Ekstrom taught a system further comprising a DHCP server operable to assign, in a case where it is determined that said MAC address of said one of said network devices is stored in said entrance database (column 7, lines 11-20), an IP address to said one of said network devices (column 7, lines 30-34).

12. Regarding dependent claim 14, Ekstrom taught said entrance server has an entrance database operable to store user identifying information for identifying a

corresponding user of said each of said network devices (column 10, lines 20-22), and permits a corresponding one of said network devices that sent said user identifying information stored in said entrance database to enter said computer network system (column 10, lines 14-22).

13. Regarding dependent claim 15, Ekstrom taught said administration server assigns, to said entrance server, a VLAN that allows said entrance server to communicate with said plurality of VLANs respectively assigned to said plurality of units (column 4, lines 28-43).

14. Regarding dependent claim 16, Ekstrom taught further comprising a shared server operable to give a plurality of network devices common information that is common thereto (column 3, lines 19-28), each of said plurality of units having therein at least one of said plurality of network devices (column 2, lines 6-12).

15. Regarding dependent claim 17, Ekstrom taught said administration server assigns, to said shared server (column 4, lines 56-61), a VLAN that allows said shared server to communicate with said plurality of VLANs respectively assigned to said plurality of units (column 5, lines 7-10).

16. Regarding dependent claim 18, Ekstrom taught a system further comprising a DHCP server operable to assign an IP address to each of said respective network devices in said plurality of units (column 3, lines 23-31).

17. Regarding dependent claim 19, Ekstrom taught said administration server assigns, to said DHCP server, a VLAN that allows said DHCP server to communicate

Art Unit: 2155

with said plurality of VLANs respectively assigned to said plurality of units (column 4, lines 28-43).

18. Regarding dependent claim 20, Ekstrom taught each of said units includes an abnormal-state detecting unit operable to detect an abnormal state (column 1, lines 47-49) in a corresponding one of said each of said units and to notify said administration server of a detection thereof (column 8, lines 56-62), said abnormal-state detecting unit being connected to a connection port of said interconnection device other than connection port to which one of said network devices is connected (column 2, lines 1-5, column 3, lines 47-52).

19. The language of claim 21 is substantially the same as previously rejected claim 1. Therefore, claim 21 is rejected on the same rationale as claim 1.

Allowable Subject Matter

20. Claims 3-6 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

21. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art of record fails to teach or suggest wherein said administration server both administrates an entry of user of each or said units to each of said units and the entry of one of said respective network devices by said user to said computer network system.

Response to Arguments

22. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-2, 7-21 has been considered but is moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion


23. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a. Holloway et al., USPN 5,805,801: taught a managed hub that discovers each interconnect device that supports the security feature and maintains an interconnect device list of such devices and detects intrusion by an unauthorized address and reports the intrusion using the interconnect device list.

24. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patrice Winder whose telephone number is 703-305-3938. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 10:30 am-7:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on 703-308-3662. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Patrice Winder
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2155

plw